

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The office action dated October 29, 2003 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Applicant amends claims 1, 6, 10 and 16. Claims 21-43 have been withdrawn by virtue of the Restriction Requirement dated February 11, 2003. Accordingly, claims 1-20 are pending.

In the Office Action, claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kim et al. (GB 2,343,012A) (hereinafter “Kim”). Claims 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,656,824 to den Boer (hereinafter “den Boer”).

The rejection of claims 1-20 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claims 1-20 are allowable over the cited references in that each of these claims recites a combination of elements recited in independent claims 1, 10 and 16, including, for example, “a dielectric frame on the common electrode...at least a portion of the dielectric frame blocking light as a light shielding layer and the dielectric frame corresponding to a boundary portion of each domain”. None of the cited references, including Kim and den Boer, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention.

The Examiner alleges “that the dielectric frame will inherently block at least a portion of the light which is transmitted therethrough”. (Office Action of October 29, 2003, page 2, paragraph 5). In other words, the Examiner suggests that a dielectric frame will inherently filter out some of the wavelengths of light, while letting others be transmitted through. Applicant respectfully notes that the Examiner has misread the plain language of the claims. Accordingly, Applicant has amended claims 1, 10 and 16 to clarify that it is a *portion of the dielectric frame*

that *shields* light. In addition, the claims require a "dielectric frame corresponding to a boundary portion of each domain". Kim does not disclose or suggest these features of the claims, and the Examiner has not alleged at all that this feature is taught, suggested or disclosed by den Boer.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 10 and 16 and claims 2-9, 11-15, and 16-20 which depend from claim 1, are allowable over the cited references.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If the Examiner deems that a telephone conversation would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (202) 496-7500.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: December 30, 2003

Respectfully submitted,


Rebecca Goldman Rudich

Registration No.: 41,786
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500

